



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the notes, no matter where they are placed. Like a good golfer, he will overcome any number of obstacles or 'hazards'. But it seems a pity to impose on him a waste of time and energy.

(2) The rapid runner, the student of independent proclivities, who likes to make out the sense for himself and go straight to the goal with as little interruption as possible, will ignore the notes if they are segregated. In so doing, he will miss some finger-boards he much needed and some incidental illumination which he might just as well have had.

(3) Then there is the all too common 'enclitic', the student who is prone to lean heavily on external aids of some kind. If you make legitimate helps inconvenient of access to him, there are others. Whatever the demerits of the 'crib', it is a very *present* help in trouble. It can always, with the aid of a friendly paper-weight, be brought to bear just where it is wanted. Why not give the judicious and suggestive commentary, which aids but does not supplant close study of the text, equal advantage of juxtaposition? Of course, a number of these students will in any case become cribbers, but some of the better sort might be saved by putting the more honest method on a more equal footing, mechanically.

It is the second class for which I am most concerned in this matter. I take it we should like to increase the number of those who really *read* Greek and Latin, who move forward with the thought and do not, as a general thing, sit down to conduct siege operations. Yet they need to be guarded against too much reliance on divination and against a habit of inaccuracy. I believe they will use the needed suggestion if it is placed where he may run that readeth it.

The reviewer to whom I am referring, Professor Burchard, mentions one specific objection to foot-notes, that in class "when a question is asked, I note that the eyes of the students drop to the bottom of the page", etc. I recognize a possible difficulty here; but to my mind the question of the use of notes in preparation outweighs that of their possible use during the class-hour. It might help to obviate the difficulty, and, incidentally, be a good lesson in classroom etiquette, to insist that, as soon as a question is asked, the eyes of the students should be elevated to meet those of the teacher.

After all, it is pleasant, in closing, to find myself in hearty agreement with Professor Burchard when he says, elsewhere in his review, "Books of this kind are made primarily for the student . . . Very little should be put into them that the student may not be encouraged to use". I wish to emphasize the point that the student does actually need a good deal of encouragement to use the notes, and that it is distinctly discouraging to him to have to close the text where he is reading and go off on an exploring expedition to the back of the book after a note which, after all, may not be there, not to mention other horrid possibilities.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

W. A. ECKELS.

LAUS FUMANDI¹

Fumet is qui numquam fumat, quique fumat fumet is. Ecce conveniunt sodales philologi in cenaculum; ianua clausast, lumen adstat, circa mensam sedimus; hinc abite nunc sermones docte disceptantium

¹Verses read at a smoker held by the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Philological Association.

de Latina seu de Graeca seu de lingua Gallica.

Fumet is qui numquam fumat, quique fumat fumet is. Nil moramur quaestiones quas severi disputant; nil grammatica, nil rhetorica, nobis nil historiarum; Algonqui, Germani, Russi, Celtae Burgundique quid senserint vel scriptitarint nil ad nos hodie attinet. Veniat Bacchus (sed Monacensis—non curamus Massicum),

dum poculum repletum quisque dextra caute sublevans spuma lactea reiecta fermentum hilariter bibat. Fumus veniat invocatus, precibus aequus adsiet; invocatus non recusat numen hoc placabile, lene, suave, mite, molle, sed benigne blandiens spargit nectareos odores, mulcet auras dulciter, dum fumamus gratis animis, sacra dum facimus deo. Fumet is qui numquam fumat, quique fumat fumet is. O Tobacche, nos beasti saeculi odori filios, qui bibentes hic sedemus, sollicitudine liberi, fistulisque bene refertis nubem suavem emittimus. Vos ubi nunc, dei Lucreti, aethere tecti innubilo? Paenitet vos, o caelestes, a nobis superarier? Fumet is qui numquam fumat, quique fumat fumet is.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

B. O. FOSTER.

The best part of the following quotation is the last sentence:

English university students write better English than American students—even at Harvard—is an opinion expressed by Charles F. Thwing in his book on "Universities of the World" (Macmillan). He says: "Oxford has no special chair devoted to the training of students in the art of English composition. For thirty years and more the American college has been emphasizing this department and form of instruction. The Oxford system presupposes that the writing of English is an art and a science in which it is a duty of every instructor to give tuition. The department is not a department. It does not represent segregations. It must be confessed that the result of the two systems seems to favor the Oxford interpretation and method. One comprehensive deficiency of the American system is found in the lack of a sense of style which most of the writing done by American students shows. The writing is, if clear, common; and if forceful, as it usually is not, it is yet commonplace. The writing of Oxford men may be somewhat slovenly, but it has flavor, balance, picturesqueness, good taste, allusiveness. The writing, on the whole, of the better Oxford graduate is as much superior to the writing of the better American graduate as the editorials of the London Times are superior to the editorials of the abler American daily newspaper. The reason of the Oxford superiority lies, in my judgment, in two causes. First, there is the greater attention paid to securing good English in the study of every subject. The second reason lies in the dominance of the classical tradition". From *The Globe* (New York City), September 27, 1911.

The attention of all our readers is called to the fact that, since *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* is not published in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, the dates of Numbers 5-8 will be as follows: November 4, 18, 25, December 9.